| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/613,900 | 07/11/2000 | IAN E. SMITH | XER1P006 | 9960 |

| 25696 | 7590 | 02/26/2004 |
|---|---|---|

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY
P. O. BOX 10356
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2131 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _01 December 2003_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.          2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-45_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _10,24 and 38_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-9,11-23,25-37 and 39-45_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _01 December 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      The amendment filed on 01 December 2003 is noted and made of record.

2.      Claims 1 through 45 have been presented for examination.

3.      Claims 10, 24, and 38 have been cancelled as per Applicant's request.

### *Drawings*

4.      The drawings were received on 01 December 2003. These drawings are accepted by the
Examiner.

### *Response to Arguments*

5.      Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-37, and 39-42 have been
considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6.      See further rejections that follow.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7.      The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found
in a prior Office action.

8.      Claims 1-9, 11-23, 25-37, and 39-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,546 to Biliris et al., hereinafter Biliris.

9.      As per claims 1, 15, and 29, Biliris teaches a computerized method of providing a service
comprising the steps of storing a portion of the e-mail message in a database in at least figures 1,
blocks 108a, 108z, 8, and column 5, line 46 to column 6, line 3. Biliris further teaches invoking
at least one application to provide the service responsive to the content of the e-mail received by
the e-mail invoked application server in column 1, lines 54-60 wherein he states:

> An application selection device is operable to examine at least some of the messaging entities and at least
> some of the attributes and to select an application to be invoked, from among the plurality of applications

based on the values of the examined messaging entities and attributes. An application invocation device invokes the selected application.

The application selection device and application invocation device are shown in figure 11 and discussed in column 7. Biliris discloses the claimed invention except for e-mail aliasing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include e-mail aliasing since e-mail aliasing is a common and well-known practice in the art for providing a simpler method of addressing an e-mail. **Newton's Telecom Dictionary** defines it as an alias e-mail address, and reads:

> An internet service provider called IBM.net explains their definition of alias email address as follows: "To change your email address, you need to create an alias email ID. An alias email ID allows you to create a new email address for yourself that points back to your original email address. This service is great for people that registered with IBM internet connection services, but did not get the email address they wanted when registering. The email alias ID can be between 3 and 32 characters in length. This allows you to choose an email alias ID much longer than your original user ID, which must be between 5 and 7 characters in length. For example, you may have been assigned the email address smit394@ibm.net when registering. You could create an alias email ID that is more memorable such as joes_restaurant@ibm.net."

Regarding claims 2, 16, and 30, Biliris teaches wherein information coupled with the e-mail message is stored in the database in at least figures 6, block 408, 8, and 9, as well as column 3, line 43 to column 4, line 10 and column 4, lines 20-38.

10.     Regarding claims 3, 17, and 31, Biliris teaches wherein the at least one application is selected from the group consisting of a lead tracking application, a job requisitioning application, an even planning application, a task list management application, a project management application, and an accountability application in figure 11, in addition to column 7, lines 1-38.

11.     Regarding claims 4, 18, and 32, Biliris does not teach wherein a reply to the e-mail is utilized to advance the processing of a task. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a reply to an e-mail so as to advance the

processing of a task. Since it has been held in Biliris that e-mails can be used to invoke

applications, replying to an e-mail that spawned said task would help to advance that task if it

ever became dormant or stalled.

12.     Regarding claims 5, 19, and 33, Biliris teaches wherein the at least one application

summarizes an interaction between one or more users of the e-mail invoked application server in

figure 11, blocks 608 and 612, and column 7, lines 31-37.

13.     With regards to claims 6, 20, and 34, Biliris teaches wherein a task list is generated to

summarize the interaction in figure 11, blocks 608 and 612, and column 7, lines 31-37.

14.     Regarding claims 7, 21, and 35, Biliris does not teach wherein an event is utilized to

organize information from the database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art wherein an event is utilized to organize information from the database, since it has been

held that changing an aesthetic feature, such as organizing information, requires only routine

skill in the art. See MPEP § 2144.04; see also *In re Seid*, 161 F.2d 229, 231, 73 USPQ 431, 433

(CCPA 1947).

15.     Regarding claims 8, 22, and 36, Biliris does not teach wherein an event is utilized to

advance the processing of a task. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to provide for an event to advance the processing of a task.

Since it has been held in Biliris that events can be used to invoke applications, providing for an

event would help to advance a task if it ever became dormant or stalled.

16.    Regarding claims 9, 23, and 37, Biliris does not teach wherein a reply to the e-mail

message is utilized to generate another e-mail message to obtain information for the database. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

provide a reply to an e-mail to obtain information for the database. Since it has been held in

Biliris that e-mails can be used to obtain information, replying to an e-mail that spawned an

application that has become quiet or dormant would aid in keeping apprised of the status of the

application.

17.    With regards to claims 11, 25, and 39, Biliris does not teach wherein the e-mail message

includes an attachment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to have an e-mail include an attachment. Since it has been held in the art

that e-mail attachments are common and convenient for transmitting data, it would have only

required routine skill in the art to include an attachment to an e-mail.

18.    Regarding claims 12, 26, and 40, Biliris teaches wherein the e-mail message has one or

more attributes, and further comprising steps of generating an index based on the one or more

attributes of the e-mail message and storing the index in the database in column 6, lines 41-62.

19.     Regarding claims 13, 27, and 41, Biliris teaches further comprising categorizing the content into one or more categories, and permitting retrieval of the information from the database according to at least one of the one or more categories in column 6, lines 7-29.

20.     Regarding claims 14, 28, and 42, Biliris teaches further comprising steps of analyzing information in the database; generating one or more summaries of the information responsive to the step of analyzing; storing the one or more summaries in the database; and permitting retrieval of at least one of the summaries from the database utilizing the network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to summarize the entries of the database and return the summaries to clients. Since it has been held in Biliris that the attributes stored would be fairly simple yet quite numerous, there exists a need to simplify user access to the contents and it would have only required routine skill in the art to summarize the database and permit access to the summaries.

21.     Concerning claims 43, 44, and 45, Biliris does not teach wherein the step of invoking at least one application is responsive to the attachment. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to invoke an application in response to an e-mail attachment. Since it has been held in Biliris that an application is invoked in response to analyzing the contents and attributes of an e-mail, it would have only required routine skill in the art to invoke an application in response to detecting an attachment.

## *Conclusion*

22.     The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

23.     The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

application invoking systems, such as:

United States Patent No. 6,256,666 to Singhal, which is cited to show a method for

remotely managing e-mail attachments.

United States Patent No. 6,629,131 to Choi, which is cited to show a registration mail

system with a sent e-mail check function.

24.     Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action.  Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.  See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

25.     A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.  In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

26.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (703) 305-7704. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

27.     If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

28.     Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

Clf

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100